



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/661,696	09/12/2003	David D. Brandt	03AB014C/ALBRP303USC	7375
7590	03/23/2010			
Susan M. Donahue Rockwell Automation, 704-P, IP Department 1201 South 2nd Street Milwaukee, WI 53204			EXAMINER BAUM, RONALD	
			ART UNIT 2439	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 03/23/2010	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/661,696	Applicant(s) BRANDT ET AL.
	Examiner RONALD BAUM	Art Unit 2439

All Participants: **Status of Application:** _____

(1) RONALD BAUM. (3) _____.

(2) BRIAN STEED. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 10 March 2010 **Time:** 9:35am

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

n/a

Claims discussed:

all

Prior art documents discussed:

n/a

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Edan Orgad/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2439

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The amending of claims 1,7,12,15-17,25,26,30-34,36,38-41,49 and 50, and previous/associated interview/discussions with the applicant's representative - Brian Steed - to address the issues involved with the claim elements rejected in the last office action (12/21/2009), has failed to ascertain patentably distinct material to amend the claims (via examiner amendment). The applicant's invention, as claimed, still essentially comprises a security management system with associated acquisition, storage, analysis/scanning and results reconfiguration/assets management, as applied to at least , a factory/automation environment, utilizing at least standard processing network devices (e.g. PLC's, PC's , etc.,). Discussed proposed potential amendments dealing with specific elements (i.e., the invention environment, protocols, network hardware elements, conformance issues, etc.,) failed to patentably distinguish the claims - insofar as overcoming a potential USC 103' obviousness rejection - at least, dealing with the obviousness of the proposed specific elements as an (obvious) intended use (e.g., PLC with I/O modules - a factory automation environment - as obvious intended use of PC's with standard peripherals on a network). Therefore, the examiner declines to reopen prosecution. Thus, any such claims submitted formally after final rejection would not be entered..